DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 736 SO 012 468

AUTHOR van de Vall, Mark; Bolas, Cheryl
TITLE Applied Social Discipline Research or Social Policy Research: The Emergence of a Professional Paradigm in Social Research.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (San Francisco, CA, 1977).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Models; *Operations Research; Organizational Theories; *Policy Formation; *Research Methodology; *Research Utilization; *Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

This paper compares and contrasts two types of social research--policy-oriented research (practical and/or applied social discipline research) and academic social science research (theory-oriented experimental research). Data are based on 120 projects of social policy research conducted in The Netherlands in the areas of industrial and labor relations, regional and urban planning, and social welfare and public health. Some of the reports were conducted by social science researchers, some by social policy researchers. To analyze each of the 120 research projects, an evaluation instrument was devised which combined a theoretical-methodological analysis of the research report, a semistructured interview with the social researcher, and a similar interview with the policymaker responsible for transforming the research results into policy measures. Findings indicated that basic theoretical and methodological recommendations were more likely to be operationalized than higher level and more abstract concepts and that researchers from inside an organization were more successful in balancing theoretical and organizational aspects of their reports than were external researchers. The conclusion is that the basic difference between the scholarly paradigm of social science research and the professional paradigm of social policy research is that social scientists prefer explanatory power to policy impact and policy researchers favor utilization over explanation. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark van de Vall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED196736

50012 468

Applied Social Discipline Research or Social Policy Research: the Emergence of a Professional Paradigm in Social Research*

Mark van de Vall
University of Leyden
and SUNY/Buffalo

and

Cheryl Bolas
Erie County Dept. of
Mental Health of New York

1. Professionalization in Social Research:

In a growing number of sciences, 'discipline' and 'practice' are developing into two distinct methodological-theoretical paradigms. The practice of medicine, for instance, covers more than merely applying such disciplines as physiology and biochemics to health problems, just as the practice of engineering encompasses more than applying theoretical physics to construction problems. In psychology, theory-oriented experimental researchers work with a paradigm that differs in many respects from the one used by therapy-oriented clinical practitioners. Sociologists call this emancipation of a practice from a discipline 'professionalization' (Foote 1974). In its own area of knowledge, however, sociology has experienced relatively little professionalization. In social science, policy-oriented research is still generally referred to as "applied social discipline research" (Lazarsfeld and Reitz 1975; Dunn and Swierzeck 1977).

Although this identification of social policy research with applied discipline research has recently come under attack (Coleman 1972; 1975), we have relatively little hard information about the epistemological

---

* Paper, presented at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977. Section: 'Toward a Reconceptualization of Research', Bernard Bass, Chairman.

differences between these two branches of social research. Even Coleman's six principles of social policy research, valuable as they are, are based upon the researcher's experiences with one case, one of the least reliable methods in social research (Isaac and Michaels 1976).

While academic sociologists conform to the epistemological norms of validity, reliability, representativeness and exactness, for instance, the question whether social policy researchers cope with identical or additional standards has not yet been systematically answered. Put in operational terms, the problem whether in social research the academic requirement of scholarly publication is identical with the professional requirement of policy utilization, has not been solved.

In an effort to answer these questions in a systematic manner, the authors have investigated 120 projects of social policy research conducted in The Netherlands. Using data from three different samples of client-oriented research projects, theoretical and methododological features of the reports of social policy research were related to the research projects' impact upon organizational policy decisions.

2. Our Method of Research and Evaluation:

Samples of 40 projects of client-oriented social research were drawn from the following sectors of social policy making in The Netherlands: (1) industrial and labor relations, (2) regional and urban planning, (3) social welfare and public health. For analyzing each of the 120 research projects a triangulated design was used, combining data from three different sources: (1) a theoretical-methodological analysis of the research report, (2) a semistructured interview with the social researcher who had conducted the project, (3) a similar interview with the policymaker responsible for transforming the research results into policy measures.[1]

In the following analysis data are used from all three sources. While in

Tables (1) through (5) the independent variables come from our analysis of the research reports, the dependent variable, used for evaluating the degree of utilization or impact, is based upon four questions in the interviews with the researchers (SR) and the policymakers (PM). Policy impact is operationally defined as: 'specific organizational decisions or measures which, according to the researcher and the policymaker, can be traced to the project of social policy research'.[2]

Summating these four indicators resulted in Overall Policy Impact-scores or (OPI/4)-scores for the social researcher (SR/OPI-4) and the policymaker (PM/OPI-4). Averaging these two scores led to a more comprehensive indicator, the Mean Overall Policy Impact-score or ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4), used in the following analysis.[3]

3. Theoretical Features of the Professional Paradigm:

3.1. Nomothetic or Ideographic Theory

When approaching a concrete social problem, social researchers will choose between using nomothetic theory, consisting of formal concepts, and ideographic theory, consisting of so-called sensitizing or grounded concepts. When deciding for the nomothetic approach, the researcher will scan the available literature for abstract concepts validated in his own or related subject areas, with the purpose of creating a more or less coherent sub-system of generalizations. When using the ideographic approach, the researcher generates low-abstract concepts directly from his data, with the primary aim of understanding the problem in a concrete, i.e. local manifestation. Considering the value attached to abstract generalizations in social science, contributing to nomothetic theory, from a discipline view, is considered preferable to generating ideographic concepts.

With this priority in mind, we will first evaluate the impact of research projects using nomothetic theory for diagnosing a problem, followed by an evaluation of projects using ideographic or grounded concepts for the same purpose.

3.2. Evaluating the Impact of Nomothetic Theory:

According to Argyris (1972), nomothetic sociological theory and concepts have low applicability, i.e. are of little use in research aimed at solving concrete organizational or social problems. In an attempt to systematically verify this impression, we have for each of the policy sectors compared the impact of research projects analyzing a problem in terms of formal theorical concepts with the impact of projects which, unintentionally or purposely, abstain from using formal sociological concepts.[4] The results of this comparison are presented in Table (1):

Table (1) here:

Although .05 significance is obtained only in the combined samples (n = 120), parallel trends in the three sectors of policy making do suggest that the use of formal sociological theory and concepts operates as a deterrent in the utilization of social policy research.[5] When controlling for projects conducted by external consultants or in-house staff employees, this result is upheld in both groups of projects ($F = 4.60$, $P < .03$). In social policy research there is a negative relationship between conforming to the disciplinary standard of using nomothetic theory, and research utilization.

3.3. Evaluating the Impact of Ideographic Theory:

Discussing the applicability of social research, Lazarsfeld, Sewell and Wilensky (1967) have reintroduced Blumer's "intermediary sensitizing concepts" as a diagnostic alternative. Sensitizing concepts are ideographic terms which in Blumer's

Table (1): Use versus non-use of formal sociological concepts in social policy research, and degree of policy impact (X/OPI-4).*

Use of nomothetic (formal) theoretical concepts	Industrial and labor relations	Regional and urban planning	Social Welfare and public health	Combined 3 samples (n = 120)
Formal concepts ARE used	11.96 (17)	12.32 (16)	9.16 (16)	11.47 (49)
Formal concepts are NOT used	15.58 (23)	16.25 (24)	12.44 (24)	14.31 (71)

* Industrial and labor relations: $F = 1.29$, $P \leq .09$. Regional and urban planning: $F = 2.37$, $P \leq .13$. Social welfare and public health: $F = 3.14$, $P \leq .08$. The combined samples: $F = 4.60$, $P \leq .03$. The independent variable is based upon an analysis of the research reports, the dependent variable upon averaged scores by social researchers and policymakers.

words, "facilitate the intellectual and practical (!) handling of social reality". In an unrelated statement, Glaser and Strauss (1967) advocate the use of "grounded" concepts in social policy research. Grounded concepts are directly generated from collected data, belonging to what Homans (1951) calls "the first order of abstraction".

Because none of the above statements is supported by systematic verification, we have compared the impact scores of projects of social policy research using grounded (sensitizing) concepts, with projects not using such ideographic terms. Controlling for research conducted by external consultants versus in-house researchers, the results are presented in Table (2):

Table (2) here:

According to the data in Table (2), our hypothesis of the applicability of ideographic concepts, based upon Lazarsfeld et al. and Glaser and Strauss, is confirmed. Projects of social policy research using sensitizing or grounded concepts tend to score higher on utilization than research projects not generating such ideographic concepts.[6]

When comparing the data used in the Tables (1) and (2) we find that in regional and urban planning (n = 40) and the combined samples (n = 120) projects of social policy research using ideographic concepts score higher on impact than projects using either formal concepts or no theoretical concepts at all.* In fact, the score of projects using ideographic concepts ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4 = 19.44) is highest of all impact-scores, indicating that none of the other independent variables reaches a higher level of utilization,

* Projects using ideographic concepts: ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4) = 15.89 (n = 22). Projects using either formal concepts or no concepts: ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4 = 11.56 (n = 98), F = 6.04, P $\leq$ .025, r = -.19, P $\leq$ .018, (r2) partial correlation external vs. internal researchers: -.22. Regional and urban planning: F = 3.18, n.s., r = -.28, P $\leq$ .04. Industrial & labor relations, and Social welfare & public health: n.s.

Table (2): Use versus non-use of grounded sociological concepts in social policy research, and degree of policy impact (X/OPI-4).*

Use of ideographic (grounded) theoretical concepts	Projects of social policy research conducted by External researchers		Internal researchers	
Grounded concepts ARE used	12.93	(14)	19.44	(8)
Grounded concepts are NOT used	10.09	(52)	13.66	(40)

* All 120 projects. External vs. internal researchers: $F = 7.48$, $P < .007$. Grounded concepts used vs. not used: $F = 10.89$, $P < .002$. The independent variable is based upon an analysis of the research reports, the dependent variable upon averaged scores by social researchers and policymakers.

The conclusion is that for enhancing the applicability of social research the scientifically low-ranking procedure of generating ideographic (sensitizing, grounded) concepts will be more effective than the academic procedure of operationalizing nomothetic (formal) concepts. Thus, in theoretical terms, the professional paradigm of social policy research differs fundamentally from the academic paradigm of social science discipline research.

4. Methodological Features of the Professional Paradigm:

4.1. Epistemological vs. Implemental Validity

Fundamental to any scientific discipline are epistemological values which in the research act manifest themselves as methodological requirements. In social science discipline research, for instance, high priority is given to the requirement of epistemological validity, i.e. that the collected data provide a true basis for theoretical verification. Social policy researchers will in addition seek 'implemental' validity, i.e. that the collected data provide a relevant basis for policy decisions (van de Vall 1975).
This raises the question whether the requirement of epistemological validity used in social discipline research is fully compatible with the requirement of implemental validity which in addition is used in social policy research. Or, in terms of our own investigation of the 120 projects of social policy research: does aiming at methodological perfection correlate positively or negatively, or not at all, with degree of research utilization?

4.2. Methodological Perfection and Policy Impact:

With the purpose of comparing the 120 projects of social policy research along the variable 'methodological perfection', eleven criteria were selected which together constitute a fairly comprehensive methodological model of social science discipline research (Boalt 1969; McTavish *et al.* 1977). The eleven requirements are: (1) formulating the social problem in terms of

independent and dependent variables, (2) explicitly formulating a priori hypotheses, (3) using representative sampling designs, (4) using controls against sample distortion, (5) applying reliability standards and controls, (6) testing for significance using acknowledged significance levels, (7) using external and internal standards of validity, (8) using unbiased and verifiable procedures of data analysis, (9) presenting conclusions drawn only from empirical information, (10) disclosure of data pro and con the conclusions, (11) miscellaneous requirements, e.g. characteristic of a particular method.

By attaching weights of (x = 1) to each of these criteria, a methodology-score ranging from 0 through 11 was constructed and, subsequently, correlated with the impact-scores ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4) of the projects.

Contrary to our expectations, this procedure resulted in a negative correlation between the methodology scores and the impact scores in all three sectors of social policy making (significant in two) and the three combined samples: industrial and labor relations: $r = -.34$, $P \leq .01$; regional and urban planning: $r = -.13$, n.s.; social welfare and public health: $r = -.24$, $P \leq .001$; the combined samples ($n = 120$): $r = -.24$, $P \leq .05$.

This leads to the rather unsettling conclusion that in social policy research rigorous adherence to the methodological requirements of social science discipline research is not instrumental to enhancing the research projects' utilization in organizational decisions. Naturally, this negative result raises further questions about the relationship between methodology and utilization. For instance, are the negative correlations due to an inherent discongruence between epistemological and implemental requirements, or to an intervening variable?

4.3. Is the Discongruence Inherent?

If we hypothesize that in social research the requirements of epistemological and implemental validity are inherently in conflict, we must also infer this to be the case in 100% of the investigated projects. The negative correlation between method and utilization should not be affected, for instance, by conditions as to whether the research has been conducted by external consultants or internal staffers. However, if the negative correlation would be found in only one of the two categories of projects, the hypothesis of inherent discongruence should be rejected.

To investigate this problem in detail, we have for each of the eleven methodological standards compared the impact-scores of the conforming projects with those of the deviating projects, while at the same time controlling for research conducted by external versus internal researchers. The results are presented in Table (3):

Table (3) here:

While projects conducted by external researchers reach a higher impact when deviating from rather than conforming with methodological standards (sign test: $n = 11$, $x = 1$, $P \leq .012$), this is not the case with projects conducted by internal researchers. In more exact terms, while among the external consultants the average impact of the deviating projects exceeds the average impact of the conforming projects with 2.32, this disparity is with .48 negligible among the internal researchers.

Although in neither of the two categories of projects methodological conformation is found to actually contribute to research utilization, the data refute our hypothesis of an inherent discongruence between the epistemological and implemental requirements in social research.

Table (3): Projects of social policy research conducted by external or internal researchers which differ from or conform to a specific methodological standard, and degree of policy impact (X/OPI-4).*

Methodological standard	External researcher Differ (X/OPI-4)	Internal researcher Differ (X/OPI-4)	External researcher Conform (X/OPI-4)	%	Internal researcher Conform (X/OPI-4)	%
Formulating problem	12.11	14.50	10.12	(65)	14.37	(58)
A priori hypotheses	11.06	14.18	9.30	(40)	14.32	(37)
Representative sample	10.52	13.50	9.99	(59)	14.17	(58)
Controlled sampling	11.36	14.90	10.01	(65)	13.05	(63)
Reliability of data	10.62	12.79	10.75	(71)	14.78	(70)
Significance testing	12.50	15.71	9.55*	(57)	12.80*	(42)
Controls for validity	13.25	14.64	9.98	(57)	14.42	(40)
Objective analysis	15.62	13.28	9.71	(79)	13.87	(63)
Empirical conclusions	11.87	15.33	9.86	(79)	13.64	(54)
Presentation pro & con	13.67	15.00	9.69**	(59)	13.90**	(58)
Miscellaneous standards	12.50	14.95	9.62	(59)	14.08	(46)

*All 120 research projects. External researchers: n = 68, internal researchers: n = 52. Total 100% due to multiple response. Except where noted $P > .05$. Within table: * $F = 4.16$, $P < .04$; ** $F = 3.98$, $P < .05$.

Instead, the data suggest the operation of an intervening variable. This is that external researchers have difficulty combining the discipline goal of creating new knowledge through diagnosing the problem with the non-discipline goals of designing policy measures and developing policy action. In comparison, the in-house researchers appear to encounter fewer difficulties in combining epistemological and implemental requirements in social policy research.[7]

5. The Paradigm of Social Policy Research:

It is evident by now that the traditional view of social policy research as applied discipline research is not supported by the data from three independent samples. On the contrary, major theoretical and methodological features of social discipline research were found to have negative applicability, with projects of social policy research conforming to scholarly standards scoring lower on utilization than projects deviating from these standards.

This outcome triggers a new question, namely, whether there are any values social policy researchers should adhere to in order to secure or enhance the utilization of their output.

To answer this question, the process of organizational policy making was divided in three subsequent stages: (1) diagnosis, i.e. investigating the social problem, (2) design, i.e. drafting suggested policy measures, and (3) development, i.e. transforming one measure into policy action (van de Vall 1975). For analytic purposes, the three stages were combined in terms of the variable 'implemental span'. The implemental span of a research project is determined by the number of policy stages covered in the research report, which leads to the following hypothesis: The greater the implemental span of projects of social policy research, in terms of the number of stages covered in the research reports, the higher the projects' impact upon organizational policy decisions. This hypothesis is verified in Table (4):

Table (4) here:

The trend in Table (4) is evident in all three policy sectors, although significant only in industrial and labor relations ($P \leq .002$), and in the combined sectors ($n = 120$, $P \leq .02$), which indicates that our hypothesis is confirmed. Thus, extending the implemental span of social policy research, in terms of policy stages covered in the report, has the effect of enhancing the projects' utilization in policy decisions. Additional analysis supports this conclusion. Reports merely diagnosing the problem score lower on impact than projects covering the the stages of diagnosis and design ($F = 2.34$, $P \leq .05$).

This conclusion is corroborated by another one, about the projects' role in the third stage, i.e. developing policy action. In Table (5) the research reports are categorized according to the degree of attention (explicit, implicit, absent) devoted to developing a specific course of policy action:

Table (5) here:

The data show a positive correlation between degree of explicit attention in the reports to developing a specific policy measure, and the projects impact upon organizational decisions.[8] This is upheld when controlling for projects conducted either by internal staff employees or external consultants ($F = 7.02$, $P \leq .002$).

A final conclusion is, then, that the more effective social policy researchers are in (a) combining epistemological and implemental requirements, and (b) extending the implemental span of their research project, the more easily the research results are co-aligned with other streams of throughput constituting the process of organizational decision making (Thompson and Tuden 1959).

Table (4): The variable 'implemental span' in reports of social policy research, and degree of policy impact (X/OPI-4)*

Implemental span in the research report	Policy impact	n
1. Diagnosing the policy problem	10.72	(20)
2. Designing policy measure(s)	12.09	(22)
3. Developing policy action	11.91	(11)
4. Diagnosing the policy problem and designing policy measure(s)	14.58	(13)
5. Designing policy measure(s) and developing policy action	17.04	(14)
6. Diagnosing the problem, designing measure(s) and developing policy action	16.92	(6)

* Excluding 11 projects not fitting in this framework. Total: $F = 2.60$, $P \leq .02$, rho = .89, $P \leq .05$. Industrial and labor relations: $F = 4.70$, $P \leq .002$. Regional and urban planning and Social welfare and public health: n.s. The independent variable is based upon an analysis of the research reports, the dependent variable upon averaged scores by social researchers and policymakers.

Table (5): Degree of explicating the development of policy action in reports of social policy research, and degree of policy impact (X/OPI-4)*

Degree of explicating the development of policy action in the research report	Policy impact	n
Development of policy action explicit in the research report	14.20	(42)
Development of policy action implicit in the research report	13.40	(15)
Development of policy action absent in the research report	7.80	(14)

* Only reports including policy problem and policy goal. $F = 4.44$, $P \leq .01$, $r = -.21$, $P \leq .04$. The independent variable is based upon ananalysis of the research reports, the dependent variable upon averaged scores by social researchers and policymakers.

6. Conclusion:

Analyzing projects of social policy research in three social sectors in The Netherlands, indications were found re the emergence of a professional paradigm of social policy research. Projects generating the theoretically low-ranking ideographic concepts scored higher on impact than research projects which either operationalized the highly valued nomothetic concepts or used no sociological theory at all. Strictly conforming to the methodological standards of social discipline research did not substantially contribute to research utilization. Exploring this rather unsettling result, internal researchers were found to be more successful in combining epistemological with implemental requirements than external researchers. The latter's greater attention to methodology indicates a discongruence between the values of discipline-oriented social scientific researchers, preferring explanatory power to policy impact, and the values of policy-oriented professional researchers, favoring utilization over explanation.[9] Extending the implemental span of social policy research, in (a) number of policy stages covered in the research report, and (b) explicit involvement in developing policy action, intensified utilization in organizational policy making. Together, the findings suggest a number of fundamental theoretical, methodological and normative differences between the scholarly paradigm of social science discipline research, and a newly emerging professional paradigm of social policy research.

- - - - - -

Footnotes:

1 For a description of the sampling procedure, data collecting and funding agencies, see Appendix (A).

2 Without hardly any exoeption we found the impact-scores rated by the policymakers (PM/OPI-4) to exceed the corresponding impact-scores ratad by the social researchers (SR/OPI-4). T explain this trend we compared the frequencies of D.K. (Don't Know) between the two groups of respondents in all 16 tables underlying this analysis (5 of which are published in this article). In 14 tables we found the number of DK's among the researchers to exceed that among the policymakers, indicating that the latter are better informed about the utilization of social policy research in organizational decisions (sign test: $n = 16$, $x = 2$, $P < .05$). Thus, when evaluating the impact of social policy research, the policymakers' assessment should at least be included in the ratings.

3 For a description of the construction, validity and reliability of the ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4)-score, see Appendix (B).

4 For the purpose of our analysis, 'formal sociological theory' is operationalized as: 'quoted from a published sociological source or sociological author'.

5 Using the related but different (PM/OPI-5)-score, an identical trend ($T = 2.52$, $P < .02$, $df = 1$, $n = 40$) was found in the sector industrial and labor relations (van de Vall, Bolas and Kang 1976).

6 Using the related but different (PM/OPI-5)-score, an identical trend ($T = 2.08$, $P < .05$, $df = 1$, $n = 40$) was found in the sector industrial and labor relations (van de Vall, Bolas and Kang 1976).

7 This may be related to the fact that in Table (3) among the methodologically conforming projects these conducted by the external researchers consistently outnumber the projects conducted by internal staffers (sign test, $n = 11$, $x = 0$, $P \leq .001$). This may suggest that external researchers have more often a predominantly scholarly orientation than internal staffers and, consequently, may more often be inclined to neglect thenon-scholarly requirements of policy utilization.

8 The question can be raised whether, to enhance their impact, social policy researchers should be familiar with various aspects of the complicated process of organizational policy formation. Several data support this suggestion. Internal researchers who devote more than one-third of their average working load to policy (i.e. non-research) tasks are found to score higher on impact than colleagues devoting less than 33% of their average working time to policy-related activities ($P \leq .05$). See also: van de Vall 1979.

9 For additional findings about this distinction between the two paradigms : van de Vall and Bolas 1977.

Appendix (A): Sampling procedure, data collecting and funding agencies:

Sampling of the (3 x 40) projects of social policy research in The Netherlands took place in three stages:
(1) All projects of social policy research conducted in The Netherlands between 1960 and 1971 were registered in the three areas of social policy making: industrial and labor relations, regional and urban planning, social welfare and public health. A questionnaire was mailed for this purpose to the membership of the Netherlands Association of Social Researchers (VSWO).
(2) From each of the resulting populations, a sub-population was drawn of projects which, according to the researcher and the policymaker, had resulted in a certain degree of utilization (impact).
(3) From each of these sub-populations, a representative sample of 40 projects was drawn, with the following characteristics: (a) use of social research methods, (b) conducted by a professional (i.e. graduated) social scientist, (c) the research results presented in a written report.

Data about the projects of social policy research were obtained through a methodological and theoretical analysis of the research report, followed by semistructured interviews with the social researcher and the policymaker. The analyses and interviews were conducted by a team of 25 Dutch social science graduates (MA, AbD, Ph D). Interviewers and coders were trained in the Dept. of Sociology, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

The research project was funded by: the Netherlands Government Ministries of Economic Affairs, Social Affairs and Public Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development. The senior author received a Special Research Fellowship # FO3 HS 44,982 for 1969-70 and 1970-71 from the National Center of Health Services Research and Development. Completion of this paper was funded by Grant # 1 RO1 MH 26687 01 SP of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Appendix (B): Construction, validity and reliability of the dependent variable:

(a) The Construction of ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4):

To measure the effect of the projects of social policy research upon organizational policy making (utilization), four indicators of policy impact were selected, each consisting of a subscore based upon the following questions with social researchers and policymakers:

1. manifest impact: identify spinoffs in decisions or measures (describe in full) from the project at the following stages of policy formation:

		weight
(A) initiating a policy	(a) advising	3
	(b) deciding	6
(B) preparing a policy	(a) advising	2
	(b) deciding	4
(C) Executing a policy	(a) advising	1
	(b) deciding	2

2. stage impact: identify spinoffs in decisions or measures (describe in full) from the project at the following stages of the research project: 1. formulating the problem, 2. operationalizing in research terms, 3. sampling and collecting

4. data analysis, 5. (in-)formal discussions, 6. (in-)formal interim reporting, 7. submitting the final research report, 8. transforming the research results into policy measures, 9. following-up on policy recommendations, 10. correcting and/or adjusting the policy recommendations, 11. otherwise. Summed weights ranging from 0 through 11.
3. certainty impact: identify spinoffs in decisions or measures (describe in full) in: 1. better perceiving the problem, 2. better understanding the problem, 3. better assessing the problem, 4. better solving the problem. Specification required. Summed weights ranging from 0 through 4.
4. latent impact: identify the following spinoffs in decisions or measures (describe in full): 1. postponing a decision, 2. enhancing rank and file participation in decisions, 3. enhancing awareness of the problem, 4. improving the policymaker's status, 5. establishing a monopoly of information, 6. prevention of (a) policy error(s). Summed weights ranging from 0 through 6.

(b) The validity of ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4):

1. content validity: to ensure content validity, open interviews were conducted with researchers and policymakers outside the samples, and used for constructing the schedules of the semistructured interviews. The 25 interviewers were trained to explore the dimensions of range, depth, role and specificity (Merton, Fiske and Kandall 1956; Galtung 1970). Items related to the specific expertise of researchers and policymakers were included in the scores. The correlation coefficients of the four items constituting the (X/OPI-4)-score are presented in Table (6):

Table (6): Intercorrelation matrix of the (X/OPI-4) score items

	1	2	3	4
1. manifest impact	1.000	.479*	.438*	.384*
2. stage impact		1.000	.305*	.496*
3. certainty impact			1.000	.319*
4. latent impact				1.000

* $P \leq .01$. Mean correlation coefficient = .405, $P \leq .01$.

2. internal validity: the score is required to be valid for all subgroups in the three samples (Neale and Liebert 1973), implying that possible distortion due to selective retention among the respondents had to be taken into account. With the projects dating from 1960-71, for instance, and the interviews being conducted in 1969-71, lacunae in the respondents' memories could have been real. Only four projects were conducted before 1964 however (3%), all large-scale projects accompanied by documentation about utilization. By recommending the respondents to consult these records, selective retention was reduced to a minimum.
3. Pragmatic validity: requires prediction with respect to an outside criterion (Kerlinger 1964). (X/OPI-4)'s pragmatic validity is indicated by the fact that although the three samples of research projects were drawn from independent populations, basic trends in one sample were also found in the other two. For an example we refer to van de Vall 1975.

4. convergent validity: this implies that when combining ratings from two groups of respondents, i.e. researchers and policymakers, the two scores will measure the same concept, in our case policy impact or utilization. Using Bohrnstedt's (1969) method for measuring convergent discriminant validity for a set of scores, the following correlations between (SR/OPO-4) and (PM/OPI-4) were established: industrial and labor relations: r = .49; regional and urban planning: r = .69; social welfare and public health: r = .52. The mean correlation of the three combined samples (n = 120): r = .57.

5. item-to-total validity: lacking hard indicators required for criterion related construct validity, the total score was used as a substitute criterion (Bohrnstedt 1969). Item analysis of the (2 x 4) items within the three samples and the combined samples resulted in:

Table (7): Item-to-total correlations in ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4) over 3 samples and the combined samples.

Subscore	Industry	Planning	Welfare & Health	All 120 projects
SR/1	.39	.54	.66	.52
SR/2	.48	.36	.22	.52
SR/3	.34	.35	.35	.36
SR/4	.28	.64	.35	.45
PM/1	.52	.46	.54	.51
PM/2	.56	.16	.38	.36
PM/3	.37	.53	.37	.42
PM/4	.44	.47	.45	.46

(c) The reliability of ($\bar{X}$/OPI-4):

The close relationship between validity and reliability notwithstanding, we have measured the reliability of (X/OPI-4)independently from the procedures used for determining validity (Bohrnstedt 1971). Using Cronbach's alpha for establishing internal consistent reliability (Bohrnstedt 1969) the results are: industrial and labor relations = .71; regional and urban planning = .75; social welfare and public health = .95; the three samples combined = .74.

References:

Argyris, C.
1972 The Applicability of Organizational Sociology, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Boalt, Gunnar
1969 The Sociology of Research, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press.

Bohrnstedt, George W.
1969 "A quick method for determining the reliability and validity of multiple-item scales", American Sociological Review, 34 (August, 542-548.
1971 "Reliability and Validity Assessment in Attitude Measurement", in Gene Summers (ed.) Attitude Measurement, Chicago, Rand McNally.

Coleman, James S.
1972 "Policy Research in the Social Sciences", Morristown, N.J., General Learning Press.

1975 "Problems of conceptualization and measurement in studying policy impacts", in K.M. Dolbaere (ed.) Public Policy Evaluation, Beverly Hills, Cal., Sage Yearbooks in Politics and Public Policy, 19-40.

Dunn, William N. and F.W. Swierzeck
1977 "Planned Organizational Change: Toward Grounded Theory", Jnl. of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 2, 135-157.

Foote, Nelson N.
1974 "Putting Sociologists to Work", The American Sociologist, 9, August, 125-134.

Galtung, Johan
1970 Theory and Methods of Social Research, London, Allen and Unwin.

Glaser, Edward M. and A.L. Strauss
1967 The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Chicago, Aldine.

Homans, George
1951 The Human Group, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Isaac, Stephen and W.B. Michael
1967 Handbook in Research and Evaluation, San Diego, Edits.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
1964 Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and J.G. Reitz
1975 An Introduction to Applied Sociology, New York, Elsevier

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., W.H. Sewell and H.L. Wilensky
1967 The Uses of Sociology, New York, Basic Books.

McTavish, Donald G., J.D. Clearly, E.E. Brent, L. Perman and K.R. Knudsen
1977 "Assessing Research Methodology: The Structure of Professional Assessments of Methodology", Sociological Methods and Research, 6, 1, 3-44.

Merton, Robert K., M. Fiske and P. Kendall
1956 The Focussed Interview, Glencoe, The Free Press.

Neale, J. and R.M. Liebert
1973 Science and Behavior, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Thompson, J. D. and A. Tuden
1959 "Strategies, Structures and Processes of Organizational Decision" in J.H. Thompson (ed.) Comparative Studies in Administration, Pittsburgh, University pf Pittsburgh Press.

van de Vall, Mark
1975 "Methodology and Utilization of Applied Social Research" The Jnl. of Applied Behavioral Science, 11, 1, 14-38.

1979 "Functions and Structure of Applied Social Research in Organizational Decision Making, A Theoretical Framework", in F. Baker and M. Schulberg (eds.) Program Evaluation in the Health Fields, Vol. II, New York, Behavioral Publications.

van de Vall, Mark and Cheryl Bolas
1977 "Policy Research as an Agent of Planned Social Intervention: An Empirical Analysis of Methods, Standards, Data Collection and Analysis" Sociological Practice, 2, 2, 77-95.

van de Vall, Mark, C. Bolas and T.S. Kang
1976 "Applied Social Research in Industrial Organizations: An Evaluation of Functions, Theory and Methods, The Jnl. of Applied Behavioral Science, 12, 2, 158-177